

10
For Stone
By John A. Freund

DR. FREUND'S REPLY

TO THE

STATEMENT

MADE BY "THE RETIRING COMMITTEE,"

IN ANSWER TO THE CHARGES MADE BY HIM

AT THE LATE

GENERAL COURTS.



DR. FREUND'S REPLY

TO THE

“STATEMENT” MADE BY “THE RETIRING COMMITTEE, IN ANSWER TO THE CHARGES MADE BY HIM AT THE LATE GENERAL COURTS.”

A “STATEMENT” purporting to be that of the “Retiring Committee” of the German Hospital, Dalston, in reality however, emanating from a small section only of that Body, having been circulated amongst the Subscribers to the Institution since Monday last, 17th instant; (who are to assemble once more at a General Court, on *Saturday* next, the 22nd instant;) and that “*Statement*” containing many misrepresentations most seriously reflecting upon the character of Dr. Freund, it has become necessary to counteract their possible effect, by such a refutation as may be easily furnished, even within the short time that is left between its circulation and the day of Meeting. To make a brief counter-statement, the *order* of the “*Statement*” of the Committee will be followed as nearly as is practicable, and the reader is requested to refer accordingly to that Document, when necessary.

MAJORITY AT THE MEETING,
NOVEMBER 27TH.

It is perfectly true that this majority appears to have been only four in number, and that only 70 voted out of 400 Governors. However, the Committee, including the Vice-Presidents and other ex-officio Members, are 50 in number; and if, after much canvassing of their own body and the party against Dr. Freund, professing to represent the sentiments of the whole Committee, could only obtain 33 votes, *themselves of course included!!*—the paid Assistant Secretary, their appointed Official!—the Carpenter of the Hospital!—and, if report says truly, at least one Semi-Official and not a Governor, all forming part of their supporters!—is it not manifest that they possess little of the confidence of their own body, and have no cause whatever to boast of that of the general supporters of the Hospital; not fifteen of whom, other than their own relatives and intimate personal connections, could be persuaded to vote in their favour?

On the other hand, the resolution that “Dr. Freund was entitled to the continued confidence of the Governors, as Directing Physician to the Hospital,” was moved by *Mr. Alderman Sidney, M. P.*; seconded by *Sir George Thomas Staunton, Bart. M. P.*, both Vice-Presidents of the Institution, who had made themselves completely acquainted with the case, and carried by 37 Governors; although many of Dr. Freund’s friends had already left the room, owing to the great length of time occupied by the Meeting (six hours), and each believing that his own individual support would not be required.

It will be in the recollection of the Governors, that at the first Special General Court on the 14th October, *when the Committee resigned for the first time (!)* there were

from 200 to 250 Governors entirely in favour of Dr. Freund, and against the proceedings of the Committee.

The Report of the Special Committee appointed to enquire into the charges made by the House Committee at the General Court on the 14th October, 1847, *does not declare the charges to be proved*, but says that the *matter of the charges appears to be proved*; nor can it say more, because they *were never proved*. Dr. Freund had not been allowed the opportunity to rebut, by evidence, the charges brought against him, nor was time given to him to make use of what he had elicited by cross-examining the principal complainant and his witness, the only persons examined; and whose statements were so contradictory and prevaricating, that if Dr. Freund had not candidly, as he did from the very first, admitted that he was betrayed into some warmth of expression under *great provocation*, as distinctly shewn in the Report of the Special Committee, the charges would most likely have fallen to the ground, having been deemed trashy and unworthy to occupy a Board of gentlemen for a lengthened investigation, who doubtless, if they had not been of that opinion, would have devoted more time to the enquiry. This Report, however, is almost entirely occupied with expressions exculpating Dr. Freund, whose momentary warmth was *justly* attributed by the Special Court of Inquiry to circumstances of *provocation* to which he had been subjected by the House Committee, who were *censured* by the above Special Court in their Report.

The *anxious consideration* devoted by the Committee, as alleged in their "*Statement*," to "the possibility of continuing to superintend the affairs of the Hospital," is evidenced by no single fact; and the "evident determination of Dr. Freund to continue a system of annoyance towards the Board" is equally unsubstantiated and groundless.

On the contrary, their anxiety to seize an opportunity of bringing some fresh complaint against Dr. Freund has been manifested by undeniable facts, as the following circumstances alone will amply prove.

Dr. Freund having continued to perform his professional duties as heretofore, to the best of his ability, experienced, immediately after the last General Court, on the first Tuesday succeeding the day of that Meeting, a most unjustifiable attack from the House Surgeon, of which he might with great propriety have made an immediate complaint. He did *not* complain; but as Dr. Freund on that occasion had proof that the under-officials and paid servants of the Establishment felt themselves to be so placed that they dare not even testify to the truth of any occurrence which took place, if it were in Dr. Freund's defence; and himself and his friends feeling the danger of his position in this respect, he was advised not to go to the Hospital unaccompanied; and at first was kindly attended several times by Mr. Markwick, Surgeon to the West-end Dispensary (in connexion with the Hospital); but as this could not be continued on account of the serious inconvenience to that gentleman, Dr. Freund afterwards took out another most respectable person with him, for the purpose of *self-protection*. And he is accused of having had a visitor in his company!—and this is represented to be one of the two “events” that “convinced the Board that it would be futile to expect any alteration in the conduct of Dr. Freund.”

From the second Physician also, Dr. Freund received an offensive letter, which, if called upon, he is ready to produce.

Dr. Freund having also been credibly informed, that some Members of the Committee, including the Chaplain of the Institution, not satisfied with the active share they

had taken in the late persecution against him, actually endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to get up charges of a *most injurious* nature against him; had subsequently occasion, in the presence of His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, at a Meeting of the Committee, on the 30th of December, at the Hospital, to refer to the information he had obtained, and it was not contradicted.

Dr. Freund, having further found it necessary to make a suggestion to the second Physician, that officer has made it a subject of rudeness, as well as complaint to the Committee, who at once took up this complaint, and now base upon it their intended resignation; but how little *this* matter—the other great “event” in the eyes of the Committee—furnishes a ground for it, will immediately be proved.

Dr. Freund, notwithstanding the trying circumstances under which he had to perform his duties at the Hospital since the last General Court, abstained from complaining, as such a course would no doubt have been commented on as recriminatory; but he has not been suffered by the Committee to remain unmolested with charges; and as his persecutors consider them sufficient to justify their present conduct, that is, to declare Dr. Freund again *unfit* for his position as Directing Physician to the Hospital, but carefully avoid, when speaking of the charges, to assign the truth of the one, and merely allude to the other, without giving the necessary information on the subject; Dr. Freund is compelled to lay the whole matter before the Governors, and leave it to them to judge, whether these two “events” can be called charges against him; and if so, whether they render him unfit for the position he has the honour to hold at the Hospital. Of these two complaints; now designated “events,” consisted the Committee’s first communication to Dr. Freund.

Their first Letter to Dr. Freund :

GERMAN HOSPITAL, Dalston,
16th December, 1847.

SIR,

I am directed by the Committee to transmit to you the following Resolution, passed at their meeting held yesterday ;

The Rev. Dr. KUPER in the Chair.

“ RESOLVED—That Dr. FREUND be informed that Dr. SUTRO has complained of his again having interfered with one of his patients, and that he be requested to give an explanation on this subject, and at the same time to explain the reason of a stranger having attended him in the Wards on two occasions, on the 9th and 11th December, during the examination of the patients, and also of the out-patients, both male and female.”

These subjects to be brought under the notice of the Committee, on Wednesday, the 22nd December.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obediently,

G. H. LILIE,

To Dr. Freund.

Assistant Secretary.

As it was of the greatest importance to Dr. Freund, as a professional man, that due publicity be given to the resolutions come to at the last Special General Court, after he had been arraigned three times before the public, he felt it his duty to draw the attention of the Committee to this subject, and to give the following answer to the above communication; *especially* as it had been publicly promised that the result, whatever it might be, should receive extensive publicity.

“ Dr. Freund having received from the Assistant-Secretary of the German Hospital, Dalston, a communication, purporting to be a Resolution of the Committee of the Hospital, and calling upon him to explain a supposed interference on his part with Dr. Sutro’s patients, and the reason of a stranger having attended him on two occasions in his visits to the Hospital, begs to state, that he would be most *willing* to give the fullest explanation of these matters, and, he believes, to the entire satisfaction of the Committee and to his own justification ; but he must respectfully decline doing this until the Committee shall have first done him an act of common justice, due to him after the last Special General Court of the Governors of the Hospital, viz. : to advertise the *Resolution of continued confidence*, moved by *Mr. Aldermany Sidney*, M.P., seconded by *Sir George Thomas Staunton*, Bart. M.P., and adopted by the Governors then present, in those papers in which the notices appeared convening the late Special General Meetings.”

“ 26, Montague-street, Russell-square,
20 December, 1847.”

To this Dr. Freund received the following answer:—

GERMAN HOSPITAL, Dalston,
20th December, 1847.

SIR,

I am directed by the Committee to transmit to you the following Resolution, passed at their meeting held this day, His Royal Highness the DUKE of CAMBRIDGE in the Chair.

Dr. Freund’s letter to the Committee of the 20th December having been read, stating his readiness to give the explanation required, on the Committee publishing in the newspapers the Resolution passed at the Special General Court of 27th November, it was *Resolved*, That the Assistant-Secretary be directed to reply to the letter of Dr Freund, and to point out to him, that no motion was made at the said Special General Court for the insertion of the Resolution in question, and

the Committee, after this statement, expect Dr. Freund will afford them the promised explanation at or before two o'clock on Thursday, the 30th of December.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Yours obediently,

“ G. H. LILIE,

Assistant-Sec.

“ To J. C. H. Freund, Esq. M.D.”

Dr. Freund, out of respect to His Royal Highness, considered it his duty to give the desired explanation, and his answer was as follows :—

“ Dr. FREUND has had the honour of receiving a Resolution, passed under the presidency of HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE, at a Meeting of the officiating Committee of the GERMAN HOSPITAL, on Wednesday, 23rd December, from which it appears that, in consequence of there having been no motion proposed to that effect, at the General Court of 27th November, they do not intend to advertise the Resolution of continued confidence in him ; and that the Committee, after this statement, expects Dr. Freund will afford them the promised explanation referred to in his note of 20th December, at or before 2 o'clock on Thursday, 30th December.

“ Dr. Freund, from his deep respect for the Royal Chairman who presided at the Meeting when his note was read, will no longer withhold the explanation desired ; but he still expects the officiating Committee will do him that act of common justice, viz. to give due publicity to the Resolution of continued confidence in him, since there have appeared no less than *thirty* advertisements convening the Meetings, where Dr. Freund had to appear as an accused party.

“ The explanation of the supposed interference on the part of Dr. Freund, in a case under Dr. Sutro's care, is as follows :—

“ Dr. Freund, accompanied by Mr. Markwick, observed at their visits to the Hospital, from 2nd December, over the next

following week, that the patient of Bed III. was labouring under severe erysipelas of the right thigh, and might be benefitted by a particular step to be adopted in the treatment, to prevent *mortification*; and when Dr. Freund, at the *end* of the week, that is, on Thursday, 9th December, perceived that what he had long apprehended, that is *mortification*, was fast approaching, and perceiving the urgent necessity of the measure, he left a few lines for Dr. Sutro, in the hands of the House Surgeon, of which the following is a copy :—

“ ‘ Dr. Freund begs leave to state to Dr. Sutro his opinion, that the patient occupying bed No. III. is suffering from a severe attack of irregular erysipelas of the thigh, the approaching and unfortunate issue of which might be prevented by a *deep* and *extensive* incision along the thigh, when no doubt matter would come out, and perhaps save the patient’s life.’ *

“ This note Dr. Freund sent to Dr. Sutro *closed*.

“ On Saturday, the 11th December, Dr. Freund found the following entry made by Dr. Sutro in the Physician’s Journal, which is *open and may be read by those who have access to the room*.†

“ ‘ Dr. Sutro having just received a most insolent note from Dr. Freund, wherein Dr. Freund again seeks to interfere with one of Dr. Sutro’s patients, Dr. Sutro must, once for all, forbid Dr. Freund to interfere in any way whatever; and must remind him of a previous case of interference,

* This is the note designated by Dr. S. as “most insolent,” and by the Committee as “most improper.” It was written in the wards, to save time, and of course Dr. F. did not make the patients acquainted with it.

† It was not only read, but the House Surgeon copied it, and read it as a sort of after-dinner entertainment, at the house of the leading persecutor, and in the presence of a stranger!

where the patient's life was not saved through Dr. Freund's interference, but the result of which had caused Dr. Freund to come to Dr. Sutro's residence, and to state that he was aware of having not the slightest right of interference. Dr. Sutro is very much surprised at Dr. Freund's renewed attempts of shewing his superior wisdom, when Dr. Sutro is in possession of such *strong facts* to prove that the interests of the patients are more injured than benefitted by Dr. Freund's interference. In this instance, Dr. Freund's unprofessional interference is not only contemptible, but ridiculous. The incision which he recommends with such pompous exhibition of wisdom, having been performed, as a matter of course, before Dr. Freund saw the patient ; which Dr. Freund ought to have noticed, before he dared to give his uncalled advice.'

"What does Dr. Freund's supposed interference amount to on this occasion ? To a well-meant suggestion, expressed in a polite manner, and sent to Dr. Sutro as a private note, who might have adopted the suggestion or not, just as he thought fit, Dr. Freund having had no other object in view but to benefit the patient whose life he considered in danger.

"The House Surgeon informed Dr. Freund on the 11th December, that he (the House Surgeon) had made an incision on Thursday morning, the 9th December ; however, it was so small, *that it escaped Dr. Freund's observation* ; and it was not merely an incision that was needed, it was a *deep and extensive* incision along the thigh which Dr. Freund suggested, an incision *deep enough* to reach the focus of the matter collected, and *extensive enough* to allow a free discharge of the same, because it was on the abundant *discharge of the matter collected that the whole beneficial result of the operation depended*. Two or three more incisions, as Dr. Freund understands, have since been found necessary, *in order to let the matter out, besides the several openings* which have formed themselves spontaneously, because the matter collected had no free exit given to it sufficiently early.

All this might have been prevented, by either making the incision much earlier (mortification would, most likely, not have taken place), or by making it *deep* and *extensive*, at the time when that step was taken by the House Surgeon.

“ This, together with the great relief afforded to the patient by the free discharge of matter, followed after each subsequent incision, amply proves the correctness of Dr. Freund’s suggestion, which, he repeats, was made for no other purpose, but for the welfare of the patient.

“ Dr. Freund may safely leave it to any one who reads the two Documents above quoted, and impartially compares the language used in both, and the manner of making the communication, to judge, *who has acted with most professional propriety on the occasion.*

“ Dr. Sutro refers also to another case of an earlier date, in connection with which he appears to insinuate that Dr. Freund’s interference is more injurious than beneficial. To Dr. Sutro’s general insinuation, Dr. Freund cannot answer, as it is not tangible ; but the case to which Dr. S. most likely refers, Dr. Freund recollects perfectly well. It was a patient, bed No. II. of the name of Brautigam, who contrived and succeeded to procure a bottle of rum, which he emptied, and immediately had an attack of *delirium tremens*.

“ When Dr. Freund saw the patient, the latter was dying ; and as *opium* is an acknowledged remedy in such cases, and had not been given yet, Dr. Freund suggested to the House Surgeon, who drew his attention to the case, the propriety of administering some opium ; but it was too late, and the patient died before Dr. Sutro again saw him.

“ It is quite true that Dr. Freund called the following day on Dr. Sutro, when they spoke about this case ; and Dr. Freund explained the reasons he had for making any suggestions on the occasion, and which at that time appeared to have been satisfactory to Dr. Sutro.

“ Concerning the other complaint, brought against Dr. Freund by the officiating Committee, that is, of his having been attended

by a stranger while visiting the patients, Dr. Freund begs to state that it is perfectly correct; he was attended twice by a visitor, whose name he entered in the journal, and Dr. Freund does not think he has thereby acted against any rules of the Hospital. The rule alluding to visitors, can only have reference to the visitors of the patients, and they have to retire from the wards while the medical officers are going round to visit the sick; but Dr. Freund is not aware of any rule forbidding the Honorary Medical Officers to bring visitors with them to the Hospital.*

“Dr. Freund anxiously seizes this opportunity to state, that there exists at present at the Hospital such a want of discipline, and such a complete disorganisation of the whole Establishment, to the incalculable injury of the patients and the Hospital generally; that a most *rigorous* and *impartial* inquiry should be instituted without delay, as the only means of saving this most valuable Institution from certain ruin.”

“26, Montague-street, Russell-square,
December 30th, 1847.”

On the very day when this answer reached the Committee, Dr. Freund was called into the presence of His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, who presided at the Meeting; and when again blamed for having been twice attended by a visitor, Dr. Freund stated to His Royal Highness, that he had intentionally abstained in his letter from bringing a charge against the House Surgeon, but that he dares not hesitate now to state, that the conduct of that officer, and of the servants of the Establishment, were the only reasons of his having been attended by a witness; because, observing the spirit which pervaded the whole Establishment, (no longer subject to the

* As will be seen, Dr. Freund avoided bringing in the complaint, which he would have been justified to make, against the House Surgeon.

proper control and discipline so essential to the good management of an Hospital,) he had deemed it necessary to be accompanied by some person who could witness the treatment to which he was exposed; and it was therefore, for his own protection, that he had taken there, advisedly, the visitor spoken of, and whose name he had entered in the journal. Dr. Freund further stated, that he had again tried to come to the Hospital unaccompanied, but he has to regret it extremely, because, on his having had occasion to be dissatisfied with the manner in which the patients were several times suffered to remain for days without the medicines prescribed for them, he was insolently treated even by the Dispenser.

Dr. Freund was also called to account for his charge, of the want of discipline at the Hospital, and at once brought forward facts which fully substantiated his statement.

The Governors are now in the possession of the full particulars of the two "events," which are made the ostensible reasons for declaring Dr. Freund again unfit for his station at the Hospital, and for their intended resignation.

Other reasons must have indeed existed, to which it is less convenient to refer. As is seen from the conclusion of Dr. Freund's letter of explanation to the Committee, their attention was fully drawn to the want of discipline at the Hospital, and proved as above stated. Seventeen Governors have also addressed a memorial to the officiating Committee, stating that "rumours are spread, apparently well founded, which, if correct, are of a nature to endanger the reputation, and the very existence of the Hospital," and recommending an immediate and most rigorous inquiry into the *management* and *present condition* of the Hospital; and the officiating Committee,

finding that this would be insisted on, now pretend to purport a resignation, on grounds which can scarcely have weighed with them, as they in no way, in the eyes of any reasonable man, either prove Dr. Freund's unfitness for the Hospital, or the molestation complained of by the Committee. Much more substantial ground for their real resignation they should take from the defeat they had suffered at each Special General Court, from the general number of Subscribers.

Having now disposed of the two new complaints brought against Dr. Freund by the Committee, he considers the character of the other often-repeated charges so trivial and unworthy of Gentlemen, that he will but briefly advert to them; leaving it, on the other hand, to the Governors to judge, whether the Committee have satisfactorily refuted what was stated against their conduct at the Special General Courts.

The "*tone*" adopted by Dr. Freund towards the Committee at the different meetings has been animadverted on in the "Statement;" but, any one who was present can sufficiently judge, whether his conduct, or that of some members of the Committee, was more becoming; and Dr. Freund is confident of having suppressed facts and names, when it might have been most advantageous to his cause to have mentioned them, but he absolutely avoided unnecessary exposure.

As to any "*change*" in Dr. Freund's conduct, after having been appointed Directing Physician to the Hospital, he refers to the Report of the House Committee, published and read at the first annual Dinner in February 1846: to their subsequent Report, published after the General Court in June of the same year; to their testimony given

him in March last, on his retiring from the Committee; and he would willingly refer to the Report of the Annual Court in June last, but that, unfortunately not having been printed yet, (*seven months after the Meeting*) he is unable to point out the expressions of their satisfaction. Still he remembers most gratefully the praise bestowed upon the Medical Officers at that General Court in June, by one of their own members.

The Physicians were, it is quite true, peremptorily called upon to make a *monthly report* on *each* case above a month in the Hospital; and Dr. Freund having given sufficient explanation, and being still of the same opinion, refers the reader to his letters Nos. 1 and 3, printed in the "Statement," by the Committee.

As regards the *Bazaar*, Dr. Freund's exertions in its behalf have been great, and attended with complete success; while, on the other hand, the conduct of the Committee towards him in this affair has been so rude and ungentlemanly, that he is astonished they venture to refer to it.

First of all, having received, from very distant parts of the Continent, packages for the Hospital consigned to *him*, and being made answerable by private letters from the donors for their careful preservation, and knowing how easily things are damaged at the Custom-House,* although the greatest precaution might be used, he considered it due to the benevolent donors to take them under his care; and he is not aware of any more suitable custody in which they can be placed, than in that of the members

* Complete lists of the articles received, together with the names of the Donors, Dr. F. has sent to the Committee.

who have taken an interest in the subject. It is also true, that the Committee called upon Mrs. Freund as well as himself, in a *Resolution*, to send the articles received *at once* to the Hospital, without even assigning any reason whatever for such conduct.

Dr. Freund will only mention two more instances of their behaviour in this subject :

He had obtained, through the influence of an influential officer at the General Post-office at Berlin, the gratuitous conveyance of articles transmitted to him for the Bazaar from different parts of Germany; and the General Steam Navigation Company, also at his application, generously granted a free passage for all packages from Hamburg to London; and when Dr. Freund hastened to announce these gratifying facts to the Committee, they did not even answer his letter.

Several months after, a member of the Committee, returning from a tour on the Continent, stated in Committee that he had seen, in the foreign papers, the generous offer made by the General Steam Navigation Company to further the object of the Bazaar; and then, months after the offer was made and announced to them, it was moved that a letter of thanks be written to that honourable body!

Dr. Freund received a donation of £50 for the Bazaar, from H. S. H. Prince Puckler Muskau, which he immediately forwarded to the Committee; and was given to understand, by a letter from the Honorary Secretary, that the generous contribution would at once be gratefully acknowledged to the Prince; but, to his great surprise, Dr. Freund received, only last week, a letter from the noble donor, in which he states that he has never received an acknowledgement of his contribution. The latter was handed to them in March, 1847.

A full report, in writing, of the case of *Attempted Suicide* alluded to, and still in Dr. Freund's hands, was tendered in by him at the next Meeting of the Committee a few days after the occurrence; but Mr. R. M. Phillipps not having been made acquainted, as an individual, with the full particulars before, insisted upon its being rejected; and Dr. Freund was obliged to withdraw the report, and is now accused of not having delivered any; besides, the patient was under the care of Dr. Sutro.

A patient having complained to Dr. Freund of his not being allowed the use of a book belonging to himself, (a description of the town of Venice, in Italian, he himself being a native of Italy, though speaking German); and the book having been taken from him by the nursing sister, and Dr. Freund having no reason to think it one of an improper kind, desired it might be restored to the patient; and stated to the Matron, on that occasion, that the nurses should not interfere, beyond informing the House Surgeon in such matters. Dr. Freund is not aware of having received any remonstrance on the subject.

The "Statement" now proceeds in the attempt of an answer to some of the charges produced against the Committee, and Dr. Freund is, reluctantly, obliged to enter into them.

What Dr. Freund has brought forward against the Committee, at the General Courts, he has fully substantiated; and, as regards the *trivial* nature of his accusations against them, and the "misrepresentations" he is supposed to have made, the Governors are, from what they have witnessed at all the three General Courts, in the possession of sufficient proofs, that the Committee has done the very thing they accuse him of.

RESIGNATION.

Dr. Freund is accused of having misrepresented the facts of his resignation as a Member of the Committee, but he is able to prove his statement.

When he was told that his expulsion from the Committee was discussed in his absence, and that accusation upon accusation was repeatedly brought against him, he addressed a letter to the Assistant Secretary requesting that the charges brought against him might be taken down in writing and produced to him, and was determined not to attend the subsequent or any other Meeting until his request be complied with, as he was averse to expose himself to renewed attacks and personal squabble.

At the Meeting held, as stated by the Committee, on the the 28th February, 1847, and at which Dr. Freund was to attend to explain his letter, but declined for the above reasons, a resolution was passed expelling him from the Committee, and handed to the Rev. Mr. Bernays, with the request first to induce Dr. Freund voluntarily to resign, and if he could not be persuaded to it, to give him the resolution in question. At the interview with the Rev. Gentleman, Dr. Freund declared his determination not to vacate his seat at the Board until he was made acquainted with the nature of the charges that led to their proceeding against him, and it was not until then that the Rev. Mr. Bernays, according to the instructions received, handed the resolution to Dr. Freund; and having thus fulfilled this very unpleasant task, the Rev. Gentleman had done his duty, and the affair became entirely that of Dr. Freund.

On being told by a most intimate friend, in whom Dr. Freund has the fullest confidence, that an influential Vice President had given him the assurance that there was

not the slightest charge against Dr. Freund, and that if he withdrew from the Committee he should remain unmolested in his department as Directing Physician, Dr. Freund sent in his resignation and withdrew, as expressly wished, his letter addressed to the Assistant Secretary.

Dr. Freund considers it a threat, when, on his asking for the charges brought against him, he was at once asked to resign voluntarily, and when he declined doing so a resolution was handed him dishonourably expelling him from the Committee.

HIS NAME LEFT OUT OF THE COMMITTEE.

The usage in this respect differs in different Hospitals, but at none are the honorary medical officers discarded entirely from the councils of the establishment; and perhaps most of the misunderstandings at the German Hospital might have been avoided if a different course in this matter had been adopted. It is true, when Dr. Freund was elected Directing Physician to the German Hospital, he certainly retired from the Committee as a member who had taken an active part in all the necessary arrangements besides the medical department of the Institution; but it was generally understood that he, as an honorary medical officer, was an ex-officio member of the Committee, and he was therefore astonished to hear, that not only his own name, but those of all other medical officers, were struck out, without giving the least intimation to them, which certainly was a most offensive proceeding.

Dr. Freund openly declared his disgust, and sent in his resignation as Directing Physician, (June 1846) which, at the urgent request of some of the most influential members of the Committee, he withdrew for the sake of the Hospital, and was graciously reinstated a member of the Committee.

THREATENED DISMISSAL.

Dr. Freund, not having been the author of the article alluded to, was in no respect responsible for it: and he perfectly recollects, that when this article was made the subject of angry discussion, and even a Resolution passed on it, he stated that he was decidedly of a different opinion; and that the Committee not having published the article in question, need not take any notice of the same; and that they could by no means prevent any individual from openly expressing his opinion on the support which the Hospital received from the German Residents in London. Dr. Freund is glad that this matter has been introduced in the *Statement*, because it will enable the Governors at large to judge what language and conduct were adopted towards him, when he differed from the Board in opinion.

HOSTILE FEELING.

It is true, that Dr. Freund, always anxious to promote the welfare of the Hospital, has often brought forward much matter for the consideration of the Committee; and it is also true, that propositions of his have been so frequently and unreasonably opposed, as to excite the observations of some Members of the Committee, and to elicit from more than one of them the remark, that there was a clique in Committee who would reject any proposal coming from Dr. Freund, and applaud whatever might be proposed by other parties. If Dr. Freund repeatedly brought forward the same thing, it was usually matter, so indispensable to the welfare of the inmates of the Hospital, or of the Institution itself, that it became his duty to urge it anew on their attention; and he will, as an instance, cite the subject of the Rules for the conduct of the

patients, the introduction of which was repeatedly postponed during full 18 months. The delays in publishing the Reports for the information of the Subscribers; and the neglect in never having made any Statement in the public papers on the progress of the Hospital, furnish two more striking examples. The charge of his having been the cause of other Members discontinuing their attendance, he can with propriety and substantial proofs, turn against them, and is ready to bring forward those gentlemen, who, disapproving of their conduct towards him, ceased to attend.

Finally, Dr. Freund may safely leave this subject, concerning their feeling towards him, to the consideration of those Governors who witnessed their proceedings against him at the late public meetings.

SANATORIUM.

As regards the patient, Kaufmann, it is not an "imaginary" case, but sadly perverted in the "statement" by the Committee. Dr. Freund one day received a most urgent letter from His Excellency the Chevalier Bunsen, requesting him to visit a poor and respectable German in South-street, Manchester-square, and to admit him immediately to the Sanatorium, if there was a room vacant. Dr. Freund at once attended to it, ascertained that there was room for his admission, and proceeded himself to the residence of the patient, whom he found in the last stage of consumption and in the greatest distress. The patient most gratefully accepted the offer of gratuitous admission to one of the Sanatorium rooms, but requested to be allowed to stay a few days in the wards first, as he had been for a whole year without the company of his fellow-countrymen. This, of course, was complied with, and the patient was conveyed

to the Hospital, and it being Dr. Sutro's turn, he was placed under his care. A few days after, Dr. Freund received a resolution from the Committee, passed at a meeting, His Excellency the Chevalier Bunsen in the chair, forbidding the admission of patients who cannot pay, to the [Sanatorium], without the special permission of the Committee. On the receipt of this resolution, Dr. Freund immediately addressed His Excellency on the subject, as he could not possibly account for such a proceeding; which is besides against one of the standard laws of the Institution. He received an answer from His Excellency, urging him immediately to represent his views to the Committee, which Dr. Freund did without delay, in a detailed report, putting forth the impracticability of the measure, which would compel the medical officers to wait sometimes a fortnight before they could admit an applicant to the Sanatorium. Upon this Dr. Freund received another Resolution, "That the Committee did not see any reason to alter their Resolution."

During this time, the patient, Kaufmann, asked Dr. Freund to have him removed to the Sanatorium, since his state of health required more quiet than he could obtain in the wards; and that on account of his difficult breathing he found it necessary to have the window open all day, which could not be granted in the wards, on account of the other patients. The patient being under Dr. Sutro's care, Dr. Freund asked the latter to allow his removal to the Sanatorium, but he declined, in consequence of the resolution sent to him by the Committee. Dr. Freund having then candidly told the patient how he was situated, the latter, much hurt, asked him by what he had forfeited the promise given to him, and immediately wished to leave the Hospital. Dr. Freund persuaded him to remain a few days longer, telling him that an application had been

made; but he was not to be quieted, and left the Hospital in great disgust, after a few days, before the Committee met, and preferred to die at the workhouse, which Dr. Freund is able to prove. The "Statement" of the Committee, sets forth, that the patient left in an "improved state." Dr. Freund is of opinion, as certainly is also Dr. Sutro, that such a patient might be *relieved*, but not *improved*.

The "Statement" also refers to the case of a lady, whom he, in the face of their Resolution, had admitted to the Sanatorium.

Dr. Freund had several times been called to attend this lady, a German governess of respectability, in distress, and residing in a street in Eaton Square. She had been seized with hæmorrhage, and Dr. Freund being unable to repeat his visits, on account of the distance, he, at her request, admitted her to the Sanatorium, leaving it to herself to state her circumstances to the Committee, since she had told him that the leading members were already made acquainted with them.

The case mentioned, which Dr. Freund was called upon by the Committee either to discharge or to remove from the Sanatorium to the wards, in consequence, as they alledged, of another patient who could pay, waiting for admission, was that of a Doctor of Medicine; and as the patient had to finish a plan of treatment adopted for his complete recovery, Dr. Freund could not discharge him, nor would he commit such an act of rudeness towards a senior colleague who was in distress, as to turn him out of the Sanatorium. Dr. Freund stated his reasons to the Committee: and, protesting against their proceeding, he left it to their responsibility to act as they pleased. Two members then went up into his room and dismissed him in the name of the Committee. On enquiry, it was

also found, that no patient who would pay was waiting for admission to the Sanatorium ; and, if there was, is a patient who pays, to have the preference to one who is in distress ?

Finally, Dr. Freund cannot recollect having ever misused his trust. He only knows that he has always admitted fit and worthy objects to the Sanatorium department, and that he neither stationed his friends there to lodge at the expense of the Hospital, nor admitted menial domestics, not speaking the German language nor being natives of Germany, as individual members of the Committee have done.

BAZAAR.

Dr. Freund is accused of having forced his name upon a circular issued to promote the object of the Bazaar.—His colleagues in the Bazaar Committee have done him the justice, when accused of this on a former occasion, to state, in full Committee, that he had very reluctantly consented to have his name printed in the circular ; and having been anxious for the distribution of a circular which had been drawn up in July or August, but was not issued till four months later, to the great injury of the Bazaar business ; and therefore it was, that he would not delay to distribute them when they had once been printed, and the result will prove, that he has not been unsuccessful.

WEST END AUXILIARY SOCIETY.

The conduct of the Committee towards the zealous promoters of this Society, solely called into existence to aid the Hospital, has been simply this.—They opposed it as if it were an opposition company to the Hospital ; annoyed those who promoted its object ; and, after almost endless delay for months, they recommended its adoption, when, of the whole Society to which about 60 members had subscribed, no more than two had remained, all others

having withdrawn, in consequence of the conduct of the Committee towards them. The Society did actually not exist any more, when the sanction for it was asked and obtained by the Committee from the General Court, in June 1847. However, the few members who remained, have shown by what motives they were actuated in originating it, set anew to work, and the Society is now in full operation, and has already been of material service to the Hospital; about £80 have been collected as annual subscriptions, and sent in to the Treasurer of the Hospital, besides contributions in smaller sums which are to be sent in at the end of every year.

EXTRAVAGANCE.

The “labels” for twenty-six years are first introduced as an instance. The Committee forgets that besides the forty In-patients, there are between forty and fifty Out-patients on the days of attendance, and that it is not sufficient merely to provide one label for each Patient, but that labels of many different descriptions are wanted, and that about fifty different kinds were adopted for the Hospital; and in order to prevent any mistake in the distribution of the phials, &c., the labels for Patients of the Sanatorium, the wards, and the Out-patients, have been ordered of different colour; so that even from the colour of the label, the nurses and other attendants may at once perceive for which department the medicines are destined. If, therefore, that large number marked in the “statement” is reduced to fifty on a sheet, and the same sheet in three different colours, the quantity will at once appear much smaller; the printers also informed Dr. Freund, that a much larger number than he originally intended to order might be printed off at very little additional expense, the paper being the only charge, by which an ultimate saving

of many pounds might be obtained. But suppose that the statement is correct, it is an expense of not quite £1 per annum. There have been, till now, above three thousand patients at the Hospital; and if the Dispenser, who is already unable to do all his work, has been spared the time and trouble of writing so many thousand labels, it is really worth £1 a year.

Dr. Freund is also accused of having provided the Hospital with two kinds of apparatus for the administration of ether; both were adopted from some of the best Hospitals of London, at a time when public expectation was excited to a great degree, that patients undergoing operations should be exempted from pain. The Committee should really not forget that the Hospital is at a great distance from town, and that if only one instrument is at hand, and the least accident happens with it while an operation is performed, most serious consequences might arise. At almost all the Hospitals, an instrument-maker lives, if not in the building itself, at least close to it, so that provision might be made for any emergency.

As regards the "glaring instance of extravagance," with which Dr. Freund is charged in making a claim "of £150 for expenses incurred previous to the opening of the Hospital; Dr. Freund may confidently refer to his letters appended to the "Statement" by the Committee, and marked 11 and 11 A, which sufficiently explain this matter, and prove from their tenour and different dates, that he never mentioned the subject of reimbursement, until it was suggested to him by several Members of the Committee; nor did he ever withdraw the claim after it was once proffered, although he suffered it to be in abeyance a whole year, when the subject again was urged upon him by the Honorary Secretary, in the name of the Committee, with the request to give in, in a round sum, the amount

of his expenditure, stating some items of the same, which he did. But the most absurd feature of this charge is, that they now bring it forward, after Dr. Freund had left it entirely in their hands, to pay it or not; and Dr. Freund has never refused to pay money which he had obtained for the Hospital, although the amount, on a rough calculation, cannot be less than some thousands of pounds.

Dr Freund will only give one more instance, that he has not referred to all the items of his expenditure, and how useful he made his excursions to obtain information also in another respect. He went to Manchester, and saw the Infirmary there; in that town he obtained a Donation of £50, and an Annual Subscription of £10 10s; an introduction to a gentleman at Bradford, Yorkshire, who, on being applied to by Dr. Freund, collected about £132; another, to a gentleman at Leeds, who on a similar application, collected £42; a third, to a gentleman in London, who gave Dr. Freund a Donation of £50; and on his Manchester friends being applied to by him, with the request to establish a Convalescent Fund for the benefit of the Hospital, they collected £126 in Donations, and some £80 Annual Subscriptions. The profit, besides the information obtained at Manchester, went towards the Hospital—the expense Dr. Freund had.

Dr. Freund can, however, bring some instances of the Committee's expenditure for no useful purposes whatever. The same sum of £25, which he has spent for a useful article, the Committee was obliged to pay to the Lessee of the Hanover-Square Rooms, because they neglected to inform him, for several weeks, of the postponement of the Bazaar, intended to have been holden in May last; which prevented his re-letting the Rooms for all the five days, which had been engaged for the Bazaar at £12. 12s.

per day. Dr. Freund has besides no doubt, on strict examination of the expenditure at the Hospital, many other such items might be found.

SUSPENSION.

Every word contained in the report of charges against Dr. Freund, they state, is proved by the evidence of gentlemen, whose honour and veracity cannot be called in question.

The ten Governors who were appointed to inquire into the truth of that report, had found much cause to doubt the veracity and honour of some of those gentlemen (?); and the evidence boasted of can only have been given by the complainant, Mr. R. M. Phillipps, the Assistant-Secretary, the House Surgeon, and some other paid officials and servants of the Institution; and Dr. Freund has no doubt that they all are "ready to verify their own statement on oath," to the satisfaction of the Committee.

THERE WAS NO PREJUDGING THE CASE.

Many a step has appeared absolutely necessary in the judgment of the present Committee of the German Hospital, without, as the result has proved, their being able to justify the same before the Governors. Was there really no prejudging the case?

A very small number or section of the Committee assembled at the Hospital, suspended Dr. Freund without having had the least authority for so doing by the statutes of the Hospital, upon the statement of one of their members, the complainant, and on the evidence of the paid officials, and all this without even thinking that the defendant, also should be heard, although Dr. Freund was on that very day, (30th September), in attendance at the Hospital.

Of the Vice-Presidents, they only chose to invite those of whom they believed themselves sure. They instructed the House Surgeon to call together all the officials, the nurses and the porter not excepted, and to direct them not to obey any of Dr. Freund's orders, and the House Surgeon actually receives instructions to prevent Dr. Freund's going into the wards. They invited His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, the President of the Institution, to preside over a meeting of theirs, three days previous to the General Court of the 14th October, and having brought forward their accusations of Dr. Freund's "ill behaviour," "violent conduct," "and total unfitness," they then produced their one-sided report before His Highness, who, no doubt, in his anxiety for the welfare of the Hospital, fancying to save it from ruin, and certainly not doubting that the accused had been heard, gave his august name to the Report; and the Governors, who were called together by public advertisements, to receive a Report from the House Committee, for their consideration, actually received it already printed, on entering the room. Dr. Freund, however, on entering the room, was not furnished with a copy, and had not seen it, until one of the Governors placed it in his hands shortly before he had to get up to speak in his defence; and certainly, then it was that, disgusted with such a proceeding, and justly indignant at the false statements which he found on the very first page of that Report, he designated the same by the strongest name which is given to the falsehood; and a minute reading of its details, subsequently, has not induced him to change his opinion; although he has from the first admitted, that he was betrayed into warmth of speech, on provocation, yet he reiterates, that words have been there attributed to him which he never used, either on this occasion or at any time.

The Committee, admitting that Dr. Freund was unwearied in his exertions, impugning his motives in having proposed the Hospital, and in having taken such an active part in its being established, insinuate that he was induced to it by selfish motives. Dr. Freund thinks it beneath him to give an answer to it.

Dr. Freund regrets, that if what he has said at the first General Court respecting a Medical Gentleman, not connected professionally with the Hospital, but recently elected on the Committee by that body, should have given any offence to that gentleman, but Dr. Freund was certainly provoked, on seeing at that moment that a colleague, who could know but little of him, should have assisted in his suspension.

Of all the charges and threats, none is so materially reflecting upon his character and position in society, as the threat which they have made, that most of the medical staff would retire if he continued in office, but most fortunately for Dr. Freund, it has proved to be unfounded. He has disproved it at the last General Court, when the assertion unwarrantably had been made a few days before by His Excellency the Chevalier Bunsen; and documents have now come to hand, which confirm, that at least none of his English colleagues have given such an intimation; and as regards his German colleagues, when at the last General Court, Dr. Freund doubted their having such intentions, none of them contradicted him.

Dr. Freund is accused of having abused private confidence, with regard to what passed at a Meeting of a Deputation of the Committee the day after he had received the Resolution of being suspended; and that they did not attend "as a Deputation," the members who attended at the Hospital to prevent his going into the wards, must be aware, that unless they were there as a deputation, they

had neither a right to interfere with the performance of his duties, nor to come into the possession of a letter addressed by Dr. Freund to the Chairman of the Committee who signed the Resolution suspending him. Dr. Freund must also remind those Members, of the fact, that he distinctly stated to them on the occasion when asked, that he preferred the Meeting to be confidential; but that on matters being driven to extremities he would consider himself at liberty to make use of what passed between them; and that he therefore suggested the English language being used in preference to the German, to which they all consented. Dr. Freund stated this publicly at the first General Court, on the 14th October; and although all the three Members were present, not one of them contradicted his statement; but now it appears convenient to convert it into a new charge. Dr. Freund is really glad that the "Statement" confirms his having made the proposal to them to the effect, that a number of Governors should be selected to enquire into the matter before the Institution was suffered to be publicly exposed, and to lose thereby in the estimation of the Public; and that such proposal was at once rejected.

Dr. Freund was also told on that occasion that he would certainly be furnished with a copy of the depositions taken down against him, before the General Court took place, but the promise was never kept; it also appears now very convenient to turn that promise into another form, namely, that he should have it if he applied for it.

Dr. Freund, in the hurry of copying from different books of the Hospital, to prepare for his defence, unfortunately made a mistake with regard to the number of Out-patients. His object in speaking of this matter was to show that the Patients were not afraid of him as had been stated, but certainly not to throw any discredit on his colleagues.

This item is brought forward as one of the facts whereby Dr. Freund's veracity is to be drawn into question. Dr. Freund thinks, that in relation of this particular, as to himself, he has now satisfied every impartial reader; but it is rather surprising, that the Committee should venture to talk about veracity, when they must remember, that in consequence of their publicly resigning at the first meeting, and denying it at the second, the Governors would not trust to their verbal promise, that Dr. Freund should be reinstated pending the enquiry, but insisted on its being embodied in a Resolution, and passed in due form.

In conclusion, Dr. Freund begs to state, that the Committee, having, with their usual want of fairness towards him, abstained from sending him a copy of their "Statement" till late on Monday last, the 17th instant, he is quite unable to enter as fully into the charges and refutations therein contained as he wished. But he confidently trusts that the Governors at large will attribute any defects not to a want of proof, but to the pressure of time.

The whole of the proceedings of the Committee against Dr. Freund are based on the assumption, on the part of the former, that they were indispensable to the Hospital, while they imagined that the place of the latter might be easily supplied. In the anxiety of a few Members to get rid of an independent Medical officer, who would not give way to the arbitrary use of their authority, they entirely forgot the interests of the patients and the feelings of the governors. Although they have repeatedly admitted them-

selves, that Dr. Freund has fully answered the expectations of those who elected him; they think they may throw the advantage of possessing a conscientious Medical Officer to the winds, as long as they themselves can be made comfortable in their office, and gratify their personal spleen. In their self-sufficiency, they assumed, as an undoubted axiom, that they were the Atlas on whose shoulders alone the Hospital rested; and that as soon as they withdrew from its management, the Institution must inevitably fall; and believing this, they have succeeded in inoculating most of their colleagues (for who does not like to believe himself indispensable?) with the same faith. And now, urging one another, they ran in a body headlong into proceedings, of which almost every one of them would individually be ashamed. For months they have neglected every other duty to the Hospital and its poor inmates, for the purpose of persecuting and hunting down an individual, whom a majority of Governors have again and again declared worthy of their confidence. For this they have lavished, in advertisements, in circulars, in pamphlets, the scanty funds intrusted to them for the sacred purpose of procuring relief to their suffering brethren. In their eagerness to get rid of Dr. Freund, they have sacrificed every feeling of charity, truth and decency. Whoever has seen them act at the three last meetings, or has read any of their published papers against Dr. F., may see from these specimens, how they must have behaved to him in the Committee-room and at the Hospital. Let him judge from these exhibitions, and from the few specimens of their administration adduced in this statement, whether they are the men, to whose prudence and administrative skill the friends of the Hospital should any longer intrust their subscriptions, or to whose charity, forbearance, and brotherly kindness they should confide

the care of their sick brethren. In short, after having weighed the merits and demerits of both parties in the balance, whether they are of opinion, that in order to preserve such a Committee, they must sacrifice Dr. Freund?

20th January, 1848.